

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiesa: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/616,324	07/08/2003	Takashi Kishigami	F-7889	1319	
28107 JORDAN ANI	7590 10/10/2008 D HAMBURG LLP	EXAM	EXAMINER		
122 EAST 421	ND STREET	MCLEAN, NEIL R			
SUITE 4000 NEW YORK,	NY 10168		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2625	2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/10/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/616,324	KISHIGAMI, TAKASHI	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Neil R. McLean	2625	

	Neil R. McLean	2625							
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address									
THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.							
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe	☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time Property Prope								
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to 	he period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Anniner Note: 16 Not 1 is checked, pecked either box (a) or (p), ONLY CHECK BOX (p) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO								
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earmed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.794(b).									
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be t	iled within two months	of the date of						
2. I The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).									
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>									
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); 									
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or 									
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).									
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).						
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the 									
non-allowable claim(s).	□								
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		i be entered and an e	xplanation of						
Claim(s) allowed:									
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 2</u> .									
Claim(s) rejected: <u>7 and 2</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:									
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE									
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 									
D. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons wity it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 43(d)(1).									
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER									
Management of the request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.									
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).								
- —									
/David K Moore/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625	/Neil R. McLean/ Examiner, Art Unit 2625								

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding Applicant's Argument on page 19, lines 17-19 wherein applicant states "the present invention include the structure necessary for mixing together the the sheets printed by the first and second image forming apparatuses, such mixing being nowhere effected in the Tokura reference" and Applicant's Argument on page 24, line 17 - page 25, line 2 wherein applicant states that the Tokura reference "fails to teach (1) the above described signal conveyance and (2) the controlled mixing of color and black and white pages together onto a tray. According to the processing (1) and (2) performed in the second image forming apparatus, color/monochromatic-printed recording sheets are serialized in a sequential order and discharged to the discharging tray of one image forming apparatus."

Examiner's Response:

The limitations that the applicant refers to are Species that were non-elected in the Applicants Argument/Remards made in an amendment dated 9/19/2007. Specifically, Species III was the embodiment disclosed on page 18, line 26 of the Applicant's specification; in particular, "an image forming system operable to allow recording materials with monochrome images formed by the first image forming apparatus to be set in a sheet feed tray of the second image forming apparatus." and Species IV disclosed on page 30, lines 8-17, in particular "the color printed recording materials is stocked in a double side printing intermediate tray of the second image forming apparatus in order of page number and the monochrome printed recording materials are set in a post processing device, they the two materials are subsequently mixed together in order of page number."

These species were found to be independent and/or distinct and were not elected by the applicant. The Examiner recognized the applicant's Election of Species I with traverse in the reply filed on 9/19/2007 which the Examiner pointed out in the Non Final Rejection dated 11/27/2007 in which the Examiner responded to applicant's argument.